

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 14 and 21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments presented herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 9-12, 14, 21-24, 27, 28, 31, 41, 42 and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 14, 21-24, 27, 28, 31, 41, 42 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley (US Patent 6,487,590) in view of Waldo (US Patent 6,449,648) and Bainbridge (US Patent 6,014,700). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Foley nor Bainbridge nor Waldo, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In addition, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation *to combine* the system of Foley with those of Waldo or Bainbridge and thus, the cited references do not render obvious the claimed subject matter as a whole.

As explained in the Reply to the previous Office Action, all of the claims in some form recite the limitation that a class that implements the *proxy object is extensible* through one or more attributes to provide attribute based code. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this novel feature of the claimed subject matter. The Examiner contends that this limitation is “still met by the cited references as disclosed in the claim rejection above.” (See Final Office Action dated June 2, 2006 at p. 7). However, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner does not mention a proxy that is extensible or explain how the cited references teach or suggest such a feature. (See Final Office Action at pp. 2-7). Applicants’ representative respectfully submits that neither Waldo nor Bainbridge nor Foley, alone or in combination, teach or suggest extensible proxies as recited in the subject claims.

Moreover, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation *to combine* the system of Foley with those of Waldo or Bainbridge. The Examiner contends that “[i]t would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Bainbridge to the system of Foley because using a proxy object, the system could process the request directly by the specified server as disclosed by Bainbridge (lines 1-16 column 4).” (Final Office Action at p. 3). The cited section of Bainbridge merely describes the features of the Bainbridge system, but does not provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation *to combine* the Bainbridge system with the features of any other system. The

Examiner also contends that “[i]t would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Waldo to the system of Foley because by employing a lease on the resource, the system would have control over the access to the resource as disclosed by Waldo (line 55 column 4 to line 20 column 5).” (Final Office Action at p. 4). The cited section of Waldo merely discloses a benefit of the system of Waldo, but does not provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation to *combine* the Waldo system with the features of any other system. For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed subject matter is patentable over the cited art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 30 and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 30 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foley in view of Waldo and Bainbridge, and further in view of King (US Patent 6,681,263). Applicants’ representative respectfully contends that claims 30 and 43 as submitted in the Reply to the previous Office Action are patentable over the art of record. However, in order to expedite prosecution, these claims have been canceled.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited. In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP252US]. Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Cheryl Lee Young/

Cheryl Lee Young

Reg. No. 43,298

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731